

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292795025>

Porto and Rotterdam as European Capitals of Culture: Toward the festivalization of urban cultural policy

Article · January 2007

CITATIONS

22

READS

382

1 author:



[Erik Hitters](#)

Erasmus University Rotterdam

30 PUBLICATIONS 224 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



The state of independent music [View project](#)



Media Clusters [View project](#)

Chapter 14

Porto and Rotterdam As European Capitals of Culture: Toward the Festivalization of Urban Cultural Policy

Erik Hitters

INTRODUCTION

Since 1985 a total of twenty-six cities have had the honor of being designated as European City or Capital of Culture. The event is becoming increasingly important for cities to celebrate their own unique cultural identity within the pluriform European Union. The designation as European Capital of Culture has become much sought-after. Rotterdam was, together with Porto, Cultural Capital of Europe in 2001. Like other port cities such as Glasgow and Antwerp, Rotterdam has tried to use the event as a means of repositioning itself as a cultural city. As Bianchini (1999) has pointed out, such “declining cities” have been using culture (and cultural events more specifically) increasingly as a means of city marketing in recent years. This means that the success of the event is often judged in terms of visitor numbers or spending, rather than in terms of the cultural content or longer-term image effects of the event. This interest marks the transition of the City/Capital of Culture from a low-key cultural festival into a major engine for urban redevelopment. This chapter argues that the cultural capital event has become a key factor in the festivalization of urban cultural policy in Europe.

Relatively few of the host cities have carried out evaluative research, and this means that the assessment of the event is usually based on assertion rather than fact. There is relatively little empirical research available on the effects of the Cultural Capital event for the city (Palmer/Rae, 2004). Has it generated a substantial increase in visitors and tourists to the city? How has it affected the cultural attractiveness of the city? Has the urban economy benefited? Will the city remain a "capital of culture" in the years to come? Until now, only partial answers to such questions from scattered research in individual cities are available. In particular, there has been little comparison of the different cities and events.

This chapter provides a review of research in the 2001 European Cultural Capitals Rotterdam (Netherlands) and Porto (Portugal). It consists of comparative qualitative data and survey data. The survey data focus in particular on the sociocultural visitor profile, their expenditure, and their image of the city. More details of the surveys can be found in Richards et al. (2002). Some 3,000 visitors were surveyed on these issues across a range of different types of cultural events during the year. The results allow an initial view of the economic, social, and cultural impacts of the event to be constructed. The qualitative research looks more specifically at the effects on the urban cultural infrastructure and the policy impacts of the event. It suggests that the staging of large cultural events has become a key strategy for urban areas in the twenty-first century. The question here is whether it is possible to assess the long-term effects of such an event.

THE FESTIVALIZATION OF URBAN CULTURAL POLICY

The concept of festivalization is a fairly widely accepted phenomenon among analysts of urban policy and cultural trends (Häusserman and Siebel, 1993). In this chapter it refers to the increasing use of flagship festivals and large cultural events as a means to market major cities. Furthermore, I will argue that festivalization is not just limited to city marketing objectives but is becoming a new policy paradigm in the field of urban culture. This phenomenon can be linked to three major trends in urban cultural policy since the 1970s.

First, there was a general increase in competition between cities for the attention of tourists and other important stakeholders and consumers. As Richards and Wilson (2002) argue:

Cities (or more usually city centers) have become stages for a continual stream of events which lead eventually to the "festivalization" of the city. Tourism, leisure, sport, and culture are no longer discrete elements of consumption to be enjoyed in their own specific arenas, but simply elements of what Ritzer (1999) terms the "means of consumption," which can be enjoyed in the street as much as in the opera house. The traditional barriers between different leisure forms, such as tourism, sport and culture, are disappearing. In such a climate, cultural events in particular have emerged as a means of improving the image of cities, adding life to the city streets and giving citizens renewed pride in their home city. Culture has also become an important means of attracting tourists from outside the city. This is an important point, since the economic benefits of staging cultural events can only really be captured if spending power is attracted from outside the city.

Second, festivalization can be linked to a crisis in the legitimation of public policies. Cultural policies aimed at the social distribution of culture have not had the desired effect of an increased participation of the lower socioeconomic strata in society. The welfare state's cultural policy suffered from a legitimation crisis. Research showed that cultural participation remained high among the upper and upper middle classes, but diminished among the middle to lower classes (Knulst, 1996). What is more, cultural participation of the new upper middle class audiences was hardly a result of public policy, but of the social dynamics of status rivalry and distinction (cf. Bourdieu, 1984). Cultural policy, then, was forced to shift its focus away from "high art," toward a much more inclusive definition of (popular) culture. The policy arena thus widened its scope to pop music, film, Web design, ethnic culture, entertainment, etc. And it searched for new means of distribution that were more accessible than the traditional theaters and museums. Consequently, festivals appeared to be the panacea.

The third trend in cultural policy is the increased budgetary pressure. Although budgets for cultural policy have remained fairly stable over the last years in most European countries, one can observe increasing pressure on those budgets. This can be tied to a general trend in public policy toward more accountability and measurable objectives (Hitters, 1996). For the field of cultural policy, this has proven to be a difficult task. The solution was often found not in looking for measurable objectives within the cultural field itself, but by stressing the external effects of cultural policies. Subsequently, investments in cultural provisions and even general cultural policies are relying more and more on positive interpretations of economic impact studies, tourism growth figures, and image and city marketing data.

TOWARD A TYPOLOGY OF EUROPEAN CULTURAL CAPITALS

The Cultural Capital event was originally designed for cultural objectives, bringing together the unity and diversity of cultures in the European Union. As Corijn and Van Praet (1994) suggest in their history of Cultural Capitals, the event became a vehicle for political and socioeconomic aims, soon after its conception in 1984. The first cities organizing the event mainly staged cultural and artistic programs, such as Athens, Florence, Amsterdam, and Berlin. Most of these were fairly elitist and aimed at specialized audiences. Hardly anyone now remembers those events in these cities, whereas in Amsterdam and Paris most people presumably hardly noticed that their city was cultural capital.

A widely acknowledged turning point was Glasgow in 1990, which introduced a new model for Cultural Capitals, fusing art and culture with objectives of urban development and regeneration. Glasgow is by far the most successful of Cultural Capitals, serving as an archetype for all declining "second" cities in their efforts at enhancing their image and cultural identity. The city still benefits from the physical and image effects of the event. A third type was introduced by Antwerp in 1993. Here the event was aimed more broadly at the socioeconomic enhancement of the city. The objectives were to put Antwerp on the map as a tourist destination but also to strengthen the

organizational infrastructure in the city for the cultural and tourism sector. Also, Antwerp is usually claimed to have been successful, although the effects have worn off over the years. This, then, suggests the typology of Cultural Capitals presented in Table 14.1.

In terms of budgets, one has to remark that a comparison of budgets is very risky, since many cities included not just the costs of the cultural program in the total budget, but in some cases also capital and infrastructure costs. This is particularly noticeable in the case of Thessaloniki, but infrastructure costs were also an important element in the budget of Porto 2001. Table 14.2 should therefore be read with prudence.

Neither of the two cities covered in this chapter fit neatly into one of these types. I would, however, suggest that Porto appears to be closer to the physical regeneration type, whereas Rotterdam fits more closely with the socioeconomic type. In both cities, however, sizeable parts of the program have been culturally elitist as well.

ROTTERDAM 2001: EUROPEAN CULTURAL CAPITAL

The Rotterdam Cultural Capital event in 2001 (R2001) had a very ambitious program, which eventually included 524 projects. The R2001 attracted a total of 2,250,000 visitors. This was a satisfactory attendance as far as the organizers were concerned, but less than the claimed attendance for some other Cultural Capital years. In 1996, for example, Copenhagen claimed a total of 7.5 million event visitors, and Antwerp claimed a total of 10 million visitors in 1993. One has to

TABLE 14.1. Typology of cultural capitals.

Cultural capital ideal type	Typical effects	Effects duration	Archetypal city
Cultural elitist model	Software, cultural program	Short-term	Berlin
Urban regeneration model	Hardware, physical infrastructure	Long-term	Glasgow
Socioeconomic model	Orgware, sociocultural infrastructure	Medium-term	Antwerp

TABLE 14.2. Budget of some European cities of culture/Cultural Capitals.

Year	City	Budget in million €
1985	Athens	27.2
1986	Florence	20.4
1987	Amsterdam	9.0
1988	Berlin	27.2
1989	Paris	0.6
1990	Glasgow	54.4
1991	Dublin	45.3
1992	Madrid	22.6
1993	Antwerp	40.8
1994	Lisbon	23.6
1995	Luxemburg	136.1
1996	Copenhagen	86.2
1997	Thessaloniki	285.8
1998	Stockholm	54.4
1999	Weimar	28.1
2001	Rotterdam	23.6
2001	Porto	100+

Source: Gemeente Rotterdam (2003).

be somewhat skeptical of these figures, since such estimates often include visitors to the city who had not actually attended any of the programmed events (Richards, 2000). A more realistic comparison may be the 3.5 million visitors to the Glasgow event in 1990, or the 2.2 million visitors who actually attended cultural capital events in Antwerp in 1993. Seen in this perspective, the total attendance was reasonable, but it was achieved by staging an ambitious program.

The R2001 projects were organized by a wide range of organizations, with varying degrees of involvement by R2001. Over 65 percent of the projects received a financial subsidy from R2001, while the rest received promotional and/or marketing support. This makes it

difficult to assess the effects of the Cultural Capital event as a whole. For example, it cannot be established with any certainty what proportion of the projects in the program would have taken place without Rotterdam being designated European Cultural Capital. It is also difficult to establish how many of the visitors to events in the program came as a result of the marketing efforts of R2001 rather than the event organizers or the event venue. Because of this basic ambiguity about the extent to which R2001 itself had been instrumental in stimulating visitors to come to Rotterdam, we decided to take a very conservative approach to the estimation of its effects. In particular, it was decided to attribute visitor spending to R2001 only if it could be shown that visitors had come to the city specifically for the Cultural Capital program or to a specific event that they knew to be part of the program. In this way we can be more certain that there is a direct link between the marketing efforts of R2001 itself, visitors to the city, and their expenditure.

Methods

In order to help evaluate the extent to which R2001 was successful in achieving its aims, *Rotterdam Culturele Hoofdstad* (the event organizers) and the Rotterdam Development Corporation (OBR) asked the Arts and Culture Department of the ERASMUS University Rotterdam and the Association for Tourism and Leisure Education (ATLAS) to undertake visitor research. The main part of this study consisted of visitor surveys held at a number of events during 2001. The aim of these surveys was to establish a visitor profile for R2001 and to examine the motivations, activities, attitudes, and expenditure of people attending R2001 events. In addition to measuring the economic spin-off of the event, an important objective was to examine the image that visitors had of Rotterdam, and to evaluate whether R2001 had had any effect on that image. The long-term image effects of the event can only be measured over the next few years, but a short-term evaluation can be made by comparing the image R2001 visitors have of the city with measurements made by ATLAS in previous years in other locations. These surveys included questions about the image of different European cities as cultural destinations among cultural visitors in different European countries (Richards, 2001). The questionnaire used for the research was therefore largely based on the

TABLE 14.3. Rotterdam event typology: Share of events, visitors and survey respondents.

Orientation complexity	Local/national	International
Popular	57% Events 64% Visitors 35% Respondents	9% Events 7% Visitors 18% Respondents
High	21% Events 8% Visitors 15% Respondents	13% Events 21% Visitors 32% Respondents

ATLAS research, together with a number of questions on specific aspects of the Cultural Capital event in 2001.

In order to assess the profile of visitors to the event, a sample of events had to be selected for visitor surveys. In order to reflect the diversity of different events in the program, a number of events were selected on the basis of the type of cultural content and the type of visitors the event was aimed at. In terms of cultural content, the events can be classified along a continuum of "complexity" from high to popular culture. In terms of the visitor segments, the focus of the events can be identified as locally orientated, national, or international (see Table 14.3).

In order to examine the representativeness of the survey events, the profile of the events was compared with the total program of events. In the total program the majority of events were related to local/popular culture. However, the survey events were selected to generate a stratified random sample of visitors. In particular, it was felt important to achieve a reasonable sample of visitors from Rotterdam, the rest of the Netherlands, and abroad. Visitors were surveyed on exit from the event or attraction they were visiting. The majority of respondents were asked to fill in a self-completion questionnaire, but a large number of visitors were also interviewed by the survey team. A total of 2,153 completed questionnaires were collected from the survey events.

The Visitors

In terms of visitor origin, the weighted survey data indicate that about half of the visitors came from Rotterdam, with a further 12 per-

cent from the neighboring region of Zuid Holland. Of the 40 percent of visitors who came from further afield, the majority of visitors were from the Netherlands, but the proportion of foreign visitors, at over 16 percent of the weighted total, was above the expectations of the organizers. This was due largely to the popularity of major international events. For example, the Hieronymus Bosch exhibition attracted a total of 220,000 visitors, 67 percent of them from abroad. Most visitors to Rotterdam had visited the city before. Almost half of the visitors indicated that they visited the city regularly. Even so, 22 percent of the respondents had never visited Rotterdam before, and among visitors who came specifically for R2001, the proportion of first-time visitors to the city is even higher—30 percent. It seems that R2001 was particularly effective in attracting new foreign visitors to the city. Almost two thirds of the foreign tourists interviewed had never been in Rotterdam before.

The majority of respondents were forty or older (55 percent). Visitors from Rotterdam were on average a bit younger, but even so almost 40 percent of the residents of Rotterdam were over forty. The visitors to R2001 as a whole were a little older than the average cultural visitor in Europe, where the ATLAS research indicated that 53 percent were over forty. Although the R2001 visitors were relatively old, the proportion of sixteen- to twenty-four-year-olds was still higher than in the population of Rotterdam as a whole. Just over 13 percent of the population of Rotterdam is aged between fifteen and twenty-four, while over 19 percent of our respondents were aged sixteen to twenty-four. For the age groups under thirty, the Rotterdam tourism monitor recorded 26 percent of visitors to Rotterdam in 2001, compared with 25 percent for our research. In terms of the type of event, younger visitors tended to be found at the locally oriented events, regardless of the cultural content. Older visitors on the other hand were found in high proportions at high cultural events, particularly those with an international orientation.

In comparison with the population as a whole, the visitors to R2001 were relatively highly educated. The proportion of visitors with a higher education was about 70 percent, compared with about 21 percent for the European population as a whole, and 23 percent of the Dutch population. A high proportion of highly educated visitors is to be expected at cultural events, and education level is consistently

the best predictor of cultural participation. The majority of the respondents were working, either as employees or self-employed. The proportion of students recorded was lower than that in other ATLAS surveys (18 percent) in 2001, but the proportion of retired visitors was about the same.

The high educational level of the respondents is—not surprisingly—linked to high-level occupations and high incomes. Over 75 percent of the respondents indicated their profession fell into the top two classifications in the Dutch SBC (standard occupational classification) system, compared with 30 percent of the Dutch working population. An extremely high proportion of visitors indicated that they had an educational occupation or a job connected with culture. Almost half of the respondents indicated that their occupation was in some way connected with culture. Over 12 percent of those in employment indicated that they were teachers or lecturers, and a further 18 percent indicated they were students.

One of the aims of the R2001 event was to engage the whole population of the city in the event. In common with the other major cities in the Netherlands, Rotterdam has a significant proportion of residents who are first- or second-generation immigrants. In particular there are large populations of Moroccan or Turkish origin in Rotterdam. Ethnic origin was only monitored for the Dutch respondents to the survey, since the Dutch definition of foreign origin could not be easily applied to foreign tourists.

In total, about 19 percent of the Dutch respondents were born abroad, or had at least one parent born abroad. This is slightly higher than the proportion in the Dutch population (17 percent) but substantially lower than the proportion in the city of Rotterdam (55 percent). In particular, people from the “ethnic minorities” (e.g., Indonesia, Surinam, Turkey, Morocco) made up only 8 percent of the sample, and were therefore even less well represented than their share in the Rotterdam population (35 percent).

City Image and Festivalization

The image that visitors had of the city of Rotterdam was measured using a series of thirteen attributes (see Table 14.4). These attributes had already been used in previous image research on Rotterdam, providing the opportunity to compare the results. This, then, can provide

TABLE 14.4. Rotterdam 2001, image elements by visitor origin (% totally agree).

Image attribute of Rotterdam	Residents of Rotterdam	Residents of Zuid Holland	Other Dutch visitors	Foreign visitors	Total
Modern architecture	84.9	78.6	88.0	66.4	80.1
Water	79.9	83.8	89.1	68.5	79.6
Multicultural	83.1	81.3	85.3	60.2	77.5
Working city	84.2	79.7	81.3	57.0	76.3
International	74.4	77.5	84.3	61.8	73.7
Dynamic	66.3	70.9	75.4	44.9	63.7
Culture and art	64.0	65.3	71.3	38.1	59.0
Lots to discover	62.1	57.7	71.7	33.2	56.8
Events	65.8	60.4	65.8	26.2	55.7
Shopping	54.4	66.7	59.7	25.9	50.1
Nightlife	43.5	46.3	42.3	21.4	38.5
Cozy (<i>gezelligheid</i>)	38.5	41.1	32.2	13.0	31.1
Unsafe	20.5	19.1	21.4	8.4	17.7

us some insights as to the perception of Rotterdam as a city that is increasingly represented by an image of festivalization. In general, visitors tended to place cognitive attributes highest. The aspects of the city image that are most striking for visitors are the physical attributes of modern architecture and the water in the city, and the fact that the city has a highly multicultural population. Then come affective attributes, such as the concept of Rotterdam as a working city, its international orientation, and its dynamism. These elements of the image all stem from the function of Rotterdam as a major international port and a major industrial center. Culture and art are the highest rated of the activities that the city has to offer. This is followed by lots to discover and events, shopping and nightlife. Rotterdam is not really seen as a "cozy" (*gezellig*) city, apart from by the residents of Rotterdam. The majority of visitors do not feel that Rotterdam is unsafe, but the residents of Rotterdam feel more unsafe than visitors, perhaps because they are more aware of the crime that does take place. This indicates that festivalization, mainly represented in the affective attributes, appears not to be strongly associated with this city.

However, further analysis sheds a more nuanced light on the matter of festivalization. Some of the image attributes for Rotterdam are strongly correlated with one another and also with other aspects of the visitor experience. First, positive responses to the association of Rotterdam with events is most highly correlated with associations with "art and culture" and "lots to discover." Second, there is also a significant positive correlation ($r^2 = 0.484$) between the score given for the R2001 cultural program and the score for Rotterdam as a tourism destination. Third, the perception of Rotterdam as a city with lots of events was correlated with a high score for Rotterdam as a tourism destination. This points to a relatively successful outcome of a festivalization strategy aimed at attracting tourists to the city by staging flagship events, in this case the Cultural Capital. Apparently, the city as a cultural tourist destination benefits from this event when it is part of more general festivalization policy. Fourth, visitors below the age of thirty associate Rotterdam with events more often than visitors over thirty. These findings seem to point to a relative success of the festivalization policy of the city. Rotterdam as an event city is more highly appreciated by the young and culturally active part of the visitors to R2001, the same group that also rates the R2001 event as well as the city as a tourist destination higher than average.

Rotterdam was rated very highly as a tourist destination, with an average score of 7.5 on a 10-point scale. Residents of Rotterdam are more positive about their own city than visitors, probably due to a certain amount of local pride. Domestic tourists are also slightly more positive than the average, but foreign tourists were more critical. It is likely that Rotterdam suffers from a lack of typically "Dutch" monuments and attractions, and perhaps appeals less to foreign tourists than historical cities such as Amsterdam or the Hague. Not surprisingly, repeat visitors to the city are generally more positive than first-timers, probably because their expectations of the city are more realistic. In comparison with Porto, the other Cultural Capital for 2001, Rotterdam performed reasonably well. The general evaluation of Rotterdam is higher than for Porto. Also, the average score for the event visited on a scale from 1 through 10 was 7.1 for Porto and 7.5 for Rotterdam. The program for Porto was relatively poorly evaluated at 6.4 (R2001 6.9). In terms of the city as tourist destination, in addi-

tion, even the residents of Porto tended to be more critical about the city than the residents of Rotterdam.

The evaluation of the R2001 program as a whole was generally positive, although the score was lower than for the individual events in the program, probably because a large proportion of respondents were unable to give a score for the R2001 as a whole. This indicates that awareness of the program was relatively low, which probably had a negative effect on visitor evaluation, even for visitors who felt able to give a score. The low awareness of the program is probably related to its diversity. Because the theme "Rotterdam Is Many Cities" was designed to appeal to a wide variety of different groups, it would not be surprising if people were not aware of elements of the program that were not aimed at them. A further factor could be the marketing strategy, which placed the emphasis on devolved communications, with relatively little of the marketing budget being assigned to marketing the program as a whole. As one respondent remarked, "Apart from a few flags, you don't see much of R2001 in the city." Residents of Rotterdam also tended to be more negative about the program than visitors. In view of the fact that people traveling to Rotterdam have to make a greater investment in attending an event, there may be an element of cognitive dissonance in this difference. On the other hand, the expectations of the residents of Rotterdam may have been built up by the media prior to the event, and they may have been disappointed that the event was not more visible during the year itself. These findings point at the risk of such "aggressive" festivalization strategies, by raising expectations that become increasingly difficult to meet.

Conclusions

The most significant conclusions that can be drawn from our visitor surveys are summarized here:

1. Almost half the visitors to R2001 came from Rotterdam itself, but the event also generated more foreign tourism in the city in 2001.
2. The visitors tended to be above the age of forty, but young people between the ages of sixteen and twenty-four were also well represented.

3. Almost 70 percent of the visitors had a higher education and nearly three quarters had a high status occupation.
4. About 17 percent of the Dutch visitors to R2001 could be defined as being of foreign or ethnic origin according to official definitions. This is a reasonable reflection of the proportion of foreigners in the Dutch population as a whole, but lower than the proportion resident in Rotterdam.
5. R2001 attracted new visitors to the city. Over 22 percent of the visitor had not previously visited Rotterdam, and for visitors coming specifically for R2001 this rose to 30 percent.
6. The most important elements of the image of Rotterdam for visitors were the physical aspects of the city, particularly its modern architecture and water.
7. Culture and art are terms that suit Rotterdam according to almost 60 percent of the visitors.
8. Rotterdam as an event city is more highly appreciated by young and culturally active visitors.
9. Visitors had a high appreciation of Rotterdam as a tourist destination and were satisfied with the quality of the R2001 events they visited, but the R2001 program as a whole generated a lower level of satisfaction.

PORTO 2001: EUROPEAN CULTURAL CAPITAL

Porto is a city with a similar position to that of Rotterdam: the second city of Portugal and the industrial port city that has always stood in the shadow of the capital Lisbon. There is also a similar cultural rivalry between Porto and Lisbon as between Rotterdam and Amsterdam. The theme of the Porto 2001 Cultural Capital event was "Bridges to the Future." The aim of staging the Cultural Capital event in 2001 was not only to improve the cultural image of Porto, but also to achieve a number of more tangible improvements in terms of cultural programming, renovation of cultural infrastructures, urban and environmental renovation, and economic development and housing improvements.

Thus, Porto had a wider range of objectives than Rotterdam in 2001, which went far beyond the cultural field. Its budget was therefore much

larger than that of Rotterdam, but since it included many improvements in physical infrastructure, it is hard to compare the two. Porto 2001 staged 452 events, which attracted a total of 1.25 million visits. The urban renovation program took up the bulk of the budget but also got a lot of media attention. In comparison to Rotterdam, the festivalization strategy seems to be only of limited importance for Porto.

The research was conducted in Porto by members of the Association for Tourism and Leisure Education (ATLAS) in Portugal: the Polytechnic Institute of Viana do Castelo and the Instituto de Assistentes e Interpretes in Porto. Visitor interviews were held in seventeen different locations in Porto between April 10 and June 13, 2001. A total of 525 completed Cultural Capital questionnaires were collected. These questionnaires were largely comparable with the questionnaires used in Rotterdam, with a mix of standard ATLAS questions and the same specific questions on aspects of the Cultural Capital event (see Richards et al., 2002). A further 141 standard ATLAS questionnaires were also collected in the city in 2001. The ATLAS questions included in the surveys provide not only the option of comparing the results with Rotterdam and other survey locations in 2001, but also with the previous ATLAS surveys conducted by the University of Porto in 1992.

The Visitors

The survey respondents in 2001 tended to be relatively young compared with cultural visitors in general, with over half the respondents being under thirty years of age. This pattern shows very little change over the past decade, with 52 percent of the 1992 ATLAS survey respondents also having been under thirty. Over 40 percent of the respondents had a higher education qualification, which is slightly higher than the Portuguese ATLAS surveys carried out in 2000 (39 percent) and also very high given the relatively young age of the sample. In comparison, only 10 percent of the Portuguese population between the ages of twenty-five and sixty-four had a higher education qualification in 1999. The majority of respondents had a high status profession, with over 60 percent being managers or professionals. Again, this is higher than the ATLAS 2001 figure for the rest of Europe (48 percent). About 30 percent of respondents indicated that

their profession was connected with culture, which is lower than the previous Portuguese surveys (36 percent).

Almost 30 percent of the respondents lived or worked in Porto, with a further 46 percent being drawn from other regions of Portugal. The surrounding Norte region was the most common origin of visitors from other parts of the country (20 percent), but reasonable numbers of visitors came from the center (11 percent) and south of Portugal (12 percent). The remaining 24 percent of respondents came from abroad, with the United Kingdom, Spain, and France being the best-represented countries. In the ATLAS surveys conducted in Porto in 1992, only 65 percent of respondents were nonresident, which indicates an increase in visitors to the city over the long term. Just over 10 percent of the 1992 respondents came from abroad, which indicates a significant growth in foreign tourism in the last ten years.

In terms of cultural consumption in Porto, there was a high level of multiple-site visitation, particularly when compared with Rotterdam. This may be a result of the large proportion of visitors from outside the city who would tend to visit more than one site, and it may also be affected by the fact that interviews were conducted in the street. Whereas respondents in Rotterdam would not include the attraction they were interviewed at among their visits, the respondents in Porto would have included all sites visited in Porto. It seems that the Cultural Capital event generated considerable interest among Portuguese visitors from other parts of the country and foreign tourists. Residents of Porto were basically in the city center on business or shopping—the Cultural Capital was not very important as a motive for local people, not surprisingly.

City Image and Festivalization

Just as the theme of Porto 2001 suggests, the most obvious aspect of the image of Porto is the river (see Table 14.5), an image that is particularly strong for local residents. It is interesting to note that foreign visitors have a more positive image of Porto than visitors from other parts of Portugal in a few respects. They are slightly more likely to see Porto as a dynamic, international, multicultural city with an arts and cultural flavor than Portuguese respondents from outside Porto. This is unusual, as foreign visitors should have a weaker image of the city

TABLE 14.5. Porto 2001, image elements by visitor origin (% totally agree).

	Porto	Rest of Portugal	Foreign visitors
River	76.4	64.4	61.5
Shopping	63.8	58.1	40.0
Working city	58.4	37.8	18.9
Cozy	56.4	43.8	56.9
Nightlife	54.8	57.7	46.3
Dynamic	51.7	41.5	43.1
International	35.1	21.9	24.6
Events	32.4	30.1	24.4
Art and culture	32.2	37.9	43.8
Multicultural	27.2	20.6	29.0
Crime	16.8	13.0	5.7
Modern architecture	6.8	6.7	6.4
Unknown	1.3	4.2	7.9

than domestic tourists, which is certainly the case in Rotterdam. This suggests that Porto has been less successful in overcoming its domestic image as an industrial, provincial city than Rotterdam has. This may at least in part be due to the more muted effect of the Cultural Capital event.

In terms of activities the city has to offer, local residents tend to see Porto more as a shopping city than visitors do. This relates clearly to the fact that Porto residents are more likely to be visiting the center for shopping. Also, nightlife scores relatively well, whereas art and culture and events have a low score. Furthermore, the relatively weak score for Porto as an event city seems to indicate a very limited influence of the Cultural Capital event on the awareness of festivalization strategies.

One of the standard questions posed in the ATLAS surveys over the last few years concerns the attractiveness of a number of cities as cultural destinations. The ATLAS surveys provide a means of measuring the changing image of cities over time across Europe as a whole. When the results of the surveys in Porto itself are considered, Porto scored relatively highly as a cultural destination in comparison with other cities, which is not surprising. It was slightly surprising,

however, that Rotterdam, the other Cultural Capital in 2001, scored higher than Porto among visitors. Porto residents in particular were proud of their own city, scoring it above Lisbon as a cultural destination. The strong links between Porto and the United Kingdom also seem to be underlined by the fact that Porto residents scored London better than Paris, while all other visitors placed Paris first. In general, however, Porto does not seem to have benefited from the Cultural Capital year in terms of its image outside the city. Its score actually fell in ATLAS surveys carried out in other cities in 2001, while that of Rotterdam rose. Perhaps surprisingly, local residents were significantly more critical about the events and the program than visitors from outside the city. Less surprising was the fact that visitors coming to Porto specifically for the Cultural Capital events were more enthusiastic about the Porto 2001 program than other visitors. As in Rotterdam, festivalization policies tend to raise the critical poise of the local residents.

Conclusions

The most significant conclusions that can be drawn from our surveys are summarized here:

1. There was little change in visitor profiles in Porto in 2001.
2. Visitors were generally managers or professionals, with 44 percent having a degree in higher education.
3. There are indications of a considerable increase in foreign tourism.
4. The physical characteristics of the city tended to dominate the image of visitors, especially the river.
5. Porto's image is poorly associated with events, pointing to a limited festivalization effect.
6. Foreign visitors had a relatively positive image of the city.
7. The 2001 event did not appear to improve the image of the city.

COMPARISON AND CONCLUSION

Both the Rotterdam and the Porto Cultural Capital events in 2001 had ambitious programs, which eventually included 524 projects in

Rotterdam and 452 in Porto. Rotterdam 2001 attracted a total of 2,250,000 visitors, almost twice as many as Porto, although this is not surprising given the relatively metropolitan nature of Rotterdam and neighboring cities. These were satisfactory figures as far as the organizers were concerned, but less than the claimed attendance for some other Cultural Capital years.

Both in Rotterdam and Porto, the surveys as well as the qualitative research that was conducted after the event suggest only limited lasting effects on the city. In both cities respondents and press coverage indicated that there was a lot of positive energy in the city in that year, proving that these "working" cities deserved a cultural image as well. In Porto, however, the urban renovation in 2001 received a lot of attention, but the increase in cultural audiences and city visits melted into the air in the following year. While in Rotterdam the cultural program was much more in focus, here, too, there were few lasting effects in cultural participation or cultural tourism. For example, Richards and Wilson (2004) show that tourism in Rotterdam rose by over 10 percent in 2001, only to fall back to pre-2001 levels in 2002.

Looking back at the typology of Cultural Capitals as presented above, a city such as Porto, mainly using the urban regeneration type, may well see more benefits from that. On the one hand, Porto has lasting effects with regard to cultural venues and infrastructure as well as a renovated "baixa," the inner city. On the other hand, the Cultural Capital event might well have served as a pretext to politically and socially legitimize the physical redevelopment. In Rotterdam, that closely resembles the socioeconomic model; the effects are less tangible. Some of the network infrastructure that was built up in 2001 is still effective, but for the most part the network vanished when the event's organizing corporation disappeared from the scene, taking along most of the human capital involved with it.

With respect to the question of festivalization, one can conclude that this appears to have had its influence in both Rotterdam and Porto, but that it is predominantly the case in Rotterdam. Both cities have used the event for broad urban development or economic and social objectives. The program in Rotterdam was very inclusive of popular culture and entertainment. The findings in Rotterdam point to a limited appreciation of festivalization strategies among the young and culturally active audiences. The cultural program in Porto was

presumably more elitist, but the urban renovations benefited the entire city. However, both appear to suffer from narrowing of audience segments, with specific visitor profiles that can be tied to specific activities. One year after the event, both cities cut or redirected their cultural budgets. In that sense, the cultural sector is having a hard time proving its utility in a tougher economic climate. In both cities, festivalization seems to be a visible trend in cultural policy. Festivals, then, were used to generate change in the city, physical change in Porto, and social and cultural change in Rotterdam. The lack of structural follow-up in both cities indicates that we can observe a paradigmatic shift in cultural policy. The cultural *planning* paradigm is being slowly replaced by the paradigm of cultural *programming* of the city. The question then, is to what extent these cities can sustain their programming as cultural capitals in the years ahead.

REFERENCES

- Bianchini, F. (1999) The relationship between cultural resources and tourism policies for cities and regions: Issues from European debates. In: Dodd, D. and van Hemel, A. (eds) *Planning Cultural Tourism in Europe: A Presentation of Case Studies and Theories*. Amsterdam: Boekman Foundation, 78-89.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.
- Corijn, E. and S. Van Praet (1994) *Antwerp 1993 in the Context of European Cultural Capitals: Art Policy as Politics*. Brussels: VUB.
- Gemeente Rotterdam (2003) *Evaluatie Rotterdam Culturele Hoofdstad 2001*. Rotterdam: Bestuursdienst/Culturele zaken.
- Häussermann, H. and W. Siebel (1993) *Festivalisierung der Stadtpolitik. Stadtentwicklung durch große Projekte*. Opladen: Leviathan Sonderheft 13.
- Hitters, E. (1996) *Patronen van patronage. Mecenaat, protectoraat en markt in de kunstwereld*. Utrecht: Jan van Arkel.
- Hitters, E. (2000) The social and political construction of a cultural capital: Rotterdam 2001. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 6(2): 183-199.
- Knulst, W.P. (1996) *De milde muze*. Utrecht: LOKV.
- Palmer/Rae (2004) *European Cities and Capitals of Culture*. Brussels: Palmer/Rae Associates.
- Richards, G. (2000) The European cultural capital event: Strategic weapon in the cultural arms race? *Cultural Policy* 6(2): 159-181.
- Richards, G. (2001) *Cultural Attractions and European Tourism*. Wallingford: CAB International.
- Richards G., E. Hitters, and C. Fernandes (2002) *Rotterdam and Porto: Cultural Capitals 2001: Visitor Research*. Arnhem: Atlas.

- Richards, G. and J. Wilson (2002) The use of cultural events in city promotion: Rotterdam cultural capital of Europe 2001. Paper presented at *Events and Place Making: Building Destinations and Communities through Events*, Sydney, July 15-16, 2002.
- Richards, G. and J. Wilson (2004) The impact of cultural events on city image: Rotterdam cultural capital of Europe 2001. *Urban Studies* 41(10): 1931-1951.
- Ritzer, G. (1999) *Enchanting a Disenchanted World: Revolutionizing the Means of Consumption*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

